



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,100	02/10/2004	Rohit Chandra	22501-08686	2674

758 7590 10/06/2006

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA STREET  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
----------

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/776,100	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHANDRA, ROHIT	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ranodhi Serrao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-27,38-41,43 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-27,38-41,43 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 05 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The applicant argued that *while McKeeth mentions the term "popularity" of a link or a web site, the "popularity" of a link or web site in McKeeth is not determined from information extracted from packets traversing the network. Furthermore saying that the inventions of claims 12, 38, 43, and 48 make it possible to determine the true popularity of a web site that reflects the number of times the web site was visited by various Internet traffic even outside a particular search engine, because the popularity is determined based upon information extracted from the packets actually traversing the Internet, rather than from information merely on a particular search engine.* The examiner points out that McKeeth is not cited to teach extracting information from packets traversing the network, Tams is. Furthermore Tams is cited to teach reflecting the number of times the web site was visited by various Internet traffic even outside a particular search engine and allowing information to be extracted from the packets actually traversing the Internet.
3. The applicant furthermore argued that *Tams merely discloses a network traffic probe that collects network traffic data in general, but fails to disclose or even suggest using the collected network traffic data to determine the popularity of a particular web page as recited in claims 12, 38, 43, and 48. Tams nowhere suggests that the network traffic probe analyzes the collected network traffic data to determine the popularity of a*

*particular web page for use in ranking Internet search results.* However, Tams is not cited to teach, using the collected network traffic data to determine the popularity of a particular web page, McKeeth is. McKeeth teaches determining the popularity of a particular web page for use in ranking Internet search results. And Tams teaches that the network traffic probe analyzes the collected network traffic data. As a result *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established since all limitations have been taught by the prior art.

4. Moreover, the applicant argued that *furthermore, there is no motivation whatsoever suggested in Tams to use the network traffic probes in combination with the search engine of McKeeth to determine the popularity of a web site.* In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, in the reference. McKeeth teaches packets traversing the network since it is inherent that when a user clicks on a link, packets traverse the network. And Tams explicitly states packets traversing the network. Therefore there is motivation to combine the cited references.

5. The applicant also argued that *Matsliach does not disclose or even mention maintaining multiple counters for different geographical locations and counting the*

*number of visits to the web page from client devices in corresponding geographical locations. Indeed, col. 16, lines 16-35 of Matsliach does not even mention the term "geographical location" and has nothing to do with maintaining multiple counters for different geographical locations.* However, this is incorrect since Matsliach teaches "User demographics: age range (and optionally, the exact age of the user), gender, nickname, **user location** (state)..." Emphasis added. Therefore the prior art of record teach the invention as claimed, and the rejections are maintained. See below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 12, 22, 26, 27, 38, 43, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth (6,763,362) and Tams et al. (6,279,037).

8. As per claims 12, and 43, McKeeth teaches a search system for ranking Internet search results based upon popularity of web pages on a network (see McKeeth, abstract), and determining the popularity of the web pages based upon the extracted information, the popularity of the web pages being proportionate to actual number of visits to the web pages as indicated by the extracted information (see McKeeth, col. 7, lines 35-62); and a search engine for receiving search terms and retrieving web pages containing the search terms (see McKeeth, col. 4, lines 43-60), the search engine ranking the web pages at least in part based upon the popularity of the retrieved web pages (see McKeeth, col. 8, lines 14-40). But fails to teach the search system

comprising a plurality of monitoring devices placed in the network, the monitoring devices monitoring packets traversing the network and extracting information on the packets; a processing module coupled to the monitoring devices and receiving the extracted information from the monitoring devices, the processing module analyzing the extracted information. However, Tams et al. teaches the search system comprising a plurality of monitoring devices placed in the network, the monitoring devices monitoring packets traversing the network and extracting information on the packets (see Tams et al., col. 2, lines 13-28); a processing module coupled to the monitoring devices and receiving the extracted information from the monitoring devices, the processing module analyzing the extracted information (see Tams et al., col. 10, lines 4-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth to the search system comprising a plurality of monitoring devices placed in the network, the monitoring devices monitoring packets traversing the network and extracting information on the packets; a processing module coupled to the monitoring devices and receiving the extracted information from the monitoring devices, the processing module analyzing the extracted information in order to reduce problems due to different counting techniques and data table formats, by monitoring and processing collected network traffic data, as required, to place it into a common data format (see Tams et al., col. 6, lines 12-19).

9. As per claim 22, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach a system, wherein the processing module maintains a counter corresponding to a URL and increments a count of the counter, if the extracted information indicates that the web page corresponding to

the URL was visited, the count indicating the number of visits to the web page (see McKeeth, col. 7, lines 35-62).

10. As per claim 26, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach a search system, wherein the monitoring devices detect requests to stale web pages (see McKeeth, paragraph 0011).

11. As per claim 27, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach a search system, wherein the monitoring devices detect pages unknown to the search engine (see McKeeth, paragraph 0011).

12. As per claim 38, McKeeth teaches a method for ranking Internet search results based upon popularity of web pages (see McKeeth, abstract), the method comprising: receiving a search term; performing search of web pages on the Internet based upon the received search term (see McKeeth, col. 4, lines 43-60); retrieving a plurality of web pages containing the search term (see McKeeth, col. 11, line 50-col. 12, line 5); and ranking the web pages at least in part based upon the popularity of the retrieved web pages, the popularity of the retrieved web pages (see McKeeth, col. 12, lines 6-33); and being proportionate to actual number of visits to the web pages as indicated by the extracted information (see McKeeth, col. 7, lines 35-62). But fails to teach being determined based upon information extracted from packets traversing the Internet. However, Tams et al. teaches being determined based upon information extracted from packets traversing the Internet (see Tams et al., col. 10, lines 4-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth to being determined based upon information extracted from packets traversing the Internet in order to reduce problems due to different counting techniques and data

table formats, by processing collected network traffic data, as required, to place it into a common data format (see Tams et al., col. 6, lines 12-19).

13. As per claim 48, McKeeth teaches and determining the popularity of the links from a first web page to a plurality of second web pages based upon the extracted information; the popularity of each of the links being proportionate to number of times each of the links is actually traversed as indicated by the extracted information (see McKeeth, col. 8, lines 14-41); and a search engine for receiving search terms and retrieving web pages containing the search terms (see McKeeth, col. 4, lines 43-60), the search engine propagating a score of the first web page to the second web pages to which the first web page is linked in proportion to the popularity of links from the first web page to each of the second web pages (see McKeeth, col. 7, lines 35-62). But fails to teach a search system comprising: a plurality of monitoring devices placed in the network, the monitoring devices monitoring packets traversing the network and extracting information on the packets; a processing module coupled to the monitoring devices and receiving the extracted information from the monitoring devices, the processing module analyzing the extracted information. However, Tams et al. teaches a search system comprising: a plurality of monitoring devices placed in the network, the monitoring devices monitoring packets traversing the network and extracting information on the packets (see Tams et al., col. 2, lines 13-28); a processing module coupled to the monitoring devices and receiving the extracted information from the monitoring devices, the processing module analyzing the extracted information (see Tams et al., col. 10, lines 4-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at



the time of the invention to modify McKeeth to a search system comprising: a plurality of monitoring devices placed in the network, the monitoring devices monitoring packets traversing the network and extracting information on the packets; a processing module coupled to the monitoring devices and receiving the extracted information from the monitoring devices, the processing module analyzing the extracted information in order to reduce problems due to different counting techniques and data table formats, by processing collected network traffic data, as required, to place it into a common data format (see Tams et al., col. 6, lines 12-19).

14. Claims 13-15 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth and Tams et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Bharat (6,526,440).

15. As per claims 13 and 39, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 38 above, but fail to teach a search system, wherein the search engine ranks the retrieved web pages based upon the content of the web pages and the hyperlink structure linking the web pages as well as the popularity of the retrieved web pages. However Bharat teaches a search system, wherein the search engine ranks the retrieved web pages based upon the content of the web pages and the hyperlink structure linking the web pages as well as the popularity of the retrieved web pages (see Bharat, col. 3, lines 3-18 and col. 4, lines 13-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a search system, wherein the search engine ranks the

retrieved web pages based upon the content of the web pages and the hyperlink structure linking the web pages as well as the popularity of the retrieved web pages in order to increase the relevancy and quality of the web pages returned to the user (see Bharat, col. 1, lines 29-52).

16. As per claims 14 and 40, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 38, and 44 above, but fail to teach a search system, wherein the search engine propagates a score of a first web page to a plurality of second web pages to which the first web page is linked in proportion to the popularity of links from the first web page to each of the second web pages. However, Bharat teaches a search system, wherein the search engine propagates a score of a first web page to a plurality of second web pages to which the first web page is linked in proportion to the popularity of links from the first web page to each of the second web pages (see Bharat, col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a search system, wherein the search engine propagates a score of a first web page to a plurality of second web pages to which the first web page is linked in proportion to the popularity of links from the first web page to each of the second web pages in order to increase the relevancy and quality of the web pages returned to the user (see Bharat, col. 1, lines 29-52).

17. As per claims 15 and 41, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 38 above, but fail to teach a search system, wherein the search engine ranks a first retrieved web page in higher priority than a second retrieved web page if the popularity of the first web page is greater than the popularity of the

second web page. However, Bharat teaches a search system, wherein the search engine ranks a first retrieved web page in higher priority than a second retrieved web page if the popularity of the first web page is greater than the popularity of the second web page (see Bharat, col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a search system, wherein the search engine ranks a first retrieved web page in higher priority than a second retrieved web page if the popularity of the first web page is greater than the popularity of the second web page in order to increase the relevancy and quality of the web pages returned to the user (see Bharat, col. 1, lines 29-52).

18. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth and Tams et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Vo (2003/0229692).

19. As per claim 16, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above but fail to teach a search system, wherein the monitoring devices are placed in locations where aggregate packet traffic may be monitored. However, Vo teaches a search system, wherein the monitoring devices are placed in locations where aggregate packet traffic may be monitored (see Vo, ¶ 25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a search system, wherein the monitoring devices are placed in locations where aggregate packet traffic may be monitored to provide a network monitoring

device that monitors a network in order to gather information on the traffic flow generated by network users over the network (see Vo, ¶ 6).

20. As per claim 17, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above but fail to teach a search system, wherein the monitoring devices are placed at a traversal point for complete bi-directional activity between a client device and a server on the network. However, Vo teaches a search system, wherein the monitoring devices are placed at a traversal point for complete bi-directional activity between a client device and a server on the network (see Vo, ¶ 25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a search system, wherein the monitoring devices are placed at a traversal point for complete bi-directional activity between a client device and a server on the network to provide a network monitoring device that monitors a network in order to gather information on the traffic flow generated by network users over the network (see Vo, ¶ 6).

21. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth and Tams et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Pulley et al. (2002/0087679).

22. As per claim 18, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above, but fail to teach a search system, wherein the monitoring devices extract the information from packets in a TCP session, and the extracted information includes: a requested URI or URL; a client IP address; and a server IP address and a

Art Unit: 2141

server host name. However, Pulley et al. teaches a system, wherein the monitoring devices extract the information from packets in a TCP session (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0075), and the extracted information includes: a requested URI or URL (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0098); a client IP address (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0029); and a server IP address and a server host name (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0158). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a system, wherein the monitoring devices extract the information from packets in a TCP session, and the extracted information includes: a requested URI or URL; a client IP address; and a server IP address and a server host name in order to provide systems and methods for aggregating website activity data from a plurality of users in real-time or near real-time (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0015).

23. As per claim 19, McKeeth, Tams et al., and Pulley et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 18 above, but McKeeth and Tams et al. fail to teach a system, wherein the extracted information further includes a referrer URL. However, Pulley et al. teaches a system, wherein the extracted information further includes a referrer URL (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0098). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a system, wherein the extracted information further includes a referrer URL in order to provide systems and methods for aggregating website activity data from a plurality of users in real-time or near real-time (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0015).

24. As per claim 20, McKeeth, Tams et al., and Pulley et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 18 above, but McKeeth and Tams et al. fail to teach a system, wherein the monitoring devices analyzes the packets relating to GET Requests in the TCP session to extract the information. However, Pulley et al. teaches a system, wherein the monitoring devices analyzes the packets relating to GET Requests in the TCP session to extract the information (see Pulley et al., paragraphs 0166 and 0173). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a system, wherein the monitoring devices analyzes the packets relating to GET Requests in the TCP session to extract the information in order to provide systems and methods for aggregating website activity data from a plurality of users in real-time or near real-time (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0015).

25. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth and Tams et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,879,994 to Matsliach et al. ("Mat"). McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above, but fail to teach a system, wherein the processing module maintains a plurality of counters corresponding to a URL and increments a count of one of the counters, if the extracted information indicates that the web page corresponding to the URL was visited by a client device located in a geographical location corresponding to the counter of which the count was incremented, the count indicating the member of visits to the web page by client devices in the corresponding

geographical location. However, Mat teaches a system, wherein the processing module maintains a plurality of counters corresponding to a URL and increments a count of one of the counters, if the extracted information indicates that the web page corresponding to the URL was visited by a client device located in a geographical location corresponding to the counter of which the count was incremented, the count indicating the member of visits to the web page by client devices in the corresponding geographical location (see Mat, col. 16, lines 16-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a system, wherein the processing module maintains a plurality of counters corresponding to a URL and increments a count of one of the counters, if the extracted information indicates that the web page corresponding to the URL was visited by a client device located in a geographical location corresponding to the counter of which the count was incremented, the count indicating the member of visits to the web page by client devices in the corresponding geographical location in order to compile site usage information to determine popular "surf" patterns originating from a particular page. The patterns can be used to identify the most popular next destination(s) for users, further focused according to demographic information (see Mat, col. 5, lines 11-15).

26. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth, Tams et al., and Matsliach et al. (6,879,994) as applied to claims 12 and 23 above, and further in view of Pulley et al. (2002/0087679). McKeeth, Tams et al., and

Mat teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 23 above, but fail to teach a system, wherein the processing module increments the count only if the extracted information indicates that the web page was visited by the client device having a distinct IP address. However, Pulley et al. teaches a system, wherein the processing module increments the count only if the extracted information indicates that the web page was visited by the client device having a distinct IP address (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0098). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth, Tams et al., and Mat to a system, wherein the processing module increments the count only if the extracted information indicates that the web page was visited by the client device having a distinct IP address in order to allow an user of the website activity monitoring systems to see how in-site up-sell and side-sell banner ads drive visitors to the website to place more things into the visitors' shopping baskets, so that locations where changes or additions might be fruitful can be identified (see Pulley et al., paragraph 0054).

27. Claims 21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeth, Tams et al., and Matsliach et al. as applied to claims 12 and 23 above, and further in view of Sehm et al. (2005/0021731).

28. As per claim 21, McKeeth and Tams et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above, but fail to teach a system, wherein the monitoring devices discard packets relating to invalid URLs, invalid GET Requests, requests from a web crawler, or auto-refreshment of previous TCP sessions in extracting the information. However,



Sehm et al. teaches a system, wherein the monitoring devices discard packets relating to invalid URLs, invalid GET Requests, requests from a web crawler, or auto-refreshment of previous TCP sessions in extracting the information (see Sehm et al., paragraph 0060). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth and Tams et al. to a system, wherein the monitoring devices discard packets relating to invalid URLs, invalid GET Requests, requests from a web crawler, or auto-refreshment of previous TCP sessions in extracting the information so that when the user visits the website again, he/she is again included in the 2-5 visits counter etc. instead of the 1st counter (see Sehm et al., paragraph 0062).

29. As per claim 25, McKeeth, Tams et al., and Mat teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 23 above, but fail to teach a system, wherein the processing module does not increment the count if the extracted information indicates that the packets were automatically and repeatedly generated by a computer. However, Sehm et al. teaches a system, wherein the processing module does not increment the count if the extracted information indicates that the packets were automatically and repeatedly generated by a computer (see Sehm et al., paragraph 0064). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McKeeth, Tams et al., and Mat to a system, wherein the processing module does not increment the count if the extracted information indicates that the packets were automatically and repeatedly generated by a computer in order so that when the user visits the website again, he/she

is again included in the 2-5 visits counter etc. instead of the 1st counter (see Sehm et al., paragraph 0062).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER